

No. ID/AMB/176/81/26500.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Brij Mohan and the management of M/s. Haryana Roadways Kaithal regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of Sub-section (i) section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245 dated the 7th February, 1958 read with notification No. 5414-3Lab-68/15254 dated the 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication.

Whether the termination of service of Shri Brij Mohan was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/AMB/173/81/26506.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Sri Joginder Lal and the management of The Haryana Roadways regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245 dated 7th February, 1958 read with notification No. 5414-3 Lab-68/15254 dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication.

Whether the termination of service of Sri Joginder Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/AMB/172/81/26513.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Chanan Singh and the management of The Haryana Roadways Kaithal regarding the matters hereinafter appearing.

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government Notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245 dated 7th February, 1958 read with Notification No. 5414-3 Lab-68/15254 dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Sri Chanan Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/AMB/171/81/26518.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman and Shri Swarn Singh and the management of The Haryana Roadways Kaithal, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab-57/11245, dated, the 7th February, 1958, read with notification No. 5414-3Lab-68/15254, dated 20th June, 1968, under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Swarn Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?